DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 698 EA 006 536

AUTHOR Smith, Vivian E.; Wilson, Alfred P.
TITLE The Public School Principal's Function in General Administration as Defined by Content Analysis of Periodicals and Books. No. 74104.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Univ., Manhattan. Center for Extended Services.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 21p.; Related documents are EA 006 533-540
AVAILABLE FROM Alfred P. Wilson, Holton Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506 ($0.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Administration; *Educational Administration; Elementary Schools; Elementary Secondary Education; High Schools; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; *Principals

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the content of journal articles and books dealing with the school principalship. The articles were listed in "Education Index" and published from 1970 through 1973; the books were listed in the 1973 "Books in Print." A content analysis research method is used to determine the principal's functions in general administration and to indicate similar and unique functions at various school levels. Principal behavior is classified according to cognitive, affective, and psychomotor domains. Frequency tables present the data. The study reveals 91 separate functions in general administrative responsibility. (DW)

ED 098698

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
CENTER FOR EXTENDED SERVICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 006 536

KSU

ED 098698

The Public School Principal's Function in General Administration As Defined By Content Analysis Of Periodicals and Books[1]

Vivian E. Smith Greenfield Park, Quebec, Canada

Alfred P. Wilson Kansas State University

Additional Studies of the principalship are available by writing the authors at Holton Hall, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas 66506.

---

[1] This is one of a series of papers on the principal's function as derived from authors of books and periodical articles from 1970 through 1973.

$0.50 3

74104

Since 1916 when the Department of Secondary School Principals was organized (the Department of Elementary School Principals was established in 1920), various concepts have been formulated conc rning the expected erformance of school principals. The divergent expectations of the principal have been reported by, among others, Horowitz, et. al.[1] Sergiovanni and Carver[2], Chase[3], and Miklos[4], Goldhammer[5] seems to summarize the results best when he states that the position of the principal is uncertain and ambiguous.

---

[1]Myer Horowitz, Gary J. Anderson, and Dorothy N. Richardson, "Divergent Views of the Principal's Role: Expectations Held by Principals, Teachers and Superintendents," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, XV (December, 1969), p. 195.

[2]Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive (New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1973), pp. 175-176.

[3]T.S. Chase, "How to Meet Teachers' Expectations of Leadership," Administrator's Notebook, 1 (July, 1953), 2-3.

[4]E. Miklos, "Dimension of Conflicting Expectations and the Leader Behavior of Principals" (unpublished Doctor's dissertation, University of Alberta, 1963), p. 7.

[5]Keith Goldhammer and Gerald L. Becker, "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, Volume 6, No. 3 (April, 1970), p. 11.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PURPOSES

It is the purpose of the paper to demonstrate through contact analysis the differences that exist in the public school principalship's function in General Administration, as derived from periodicals listed in Education Index (1970 through 1973) and books listed in the 1973 edition of Books In Print.

METHOD OF STUDY

Content analysis was the research method used in this study. The content variables or categories used were selected from works by Ocker[6], Melton[7] and Snyder[8] with selected categories being added. In addition, each time a behavior was classified under one of the categories it was also considered in a two-dimensional way. First, the behavior was classified as pertaining to elementary, middle, junior or high school. When no particular school level was indicated for a given behavior, the variable was coded under the classification "Not Determined". Second, the behavior was classified as pertaining to the Cognitive, Affective or Psychomotor Domains.

---

[6]Sharon Dale Ocker, "An Analysis of Trends in Educational Administration," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1967.

[7]Joseph Melton, "Perceptions of the Ideal and Actual Role of the Elementary School Principalship," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan, 1958.

[8]Willard S. Snyder, "Elementary School Principal's Percpetions of his Ideal and Actual Role," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, United States International University, California Western Division, California, 1968.

No effort was made to tally the frequency with which particular categories of content occurred in a given publication after the initial recording had been made unless the category referred to a different level in the cognitive or affective domain or schooling. The cognitive levels are those defined by Bloom, et al.[9] The affective levels and definitions are those used by Krathwohl, et al.[10] The psychomotor domain is that defined by Harrow.[11] Coder reliability was established by using Scott's index of reliability as outlined in Holsti.[12] Results of three raters showed +1.00 on levels of the Cognitive Domain and +0.77 on levels of the Affective Domain.

---

[9] Benjamin S. Bloom, et al., eds., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1956), p. 15.

[10] Anita J. Harrow, A Taxonomy of the Psychomotor Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1972).

[11] David R. Krathwohl, Benjamin S. Bloom, and Bertram B. Mosia, Taxonomy of Educational Objectives, Handbook II: Affective Domain (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1964), p. 6.

[12] Ole R. Holsti, Content Analysis of the Social Sciences and Humanities (Mento Park, California: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969), p. 140.

Analysis of The Principal's Function in Administrative Responsibility

Periodical Analysis

Table 1 reveals that a grand total of 91 tallies were classified for the principal's function in administrative responsibility. Of this number, seven (7.7 percent) were coded at the elementary school level, zero at the middle school level, one (1.1 percent) at the junior high school level, 31 (34.1 percent) at the high school level and 52 (57.1 percent) did not refer to any specific level.

In addition to classifying each of these 91 variables according to level of schooling, each of the variables was classified also as denoting a behavior belonging to one of the subcategories of the cognitive, affective, or psychomotor domains. Table 1 shows that 29 (31.8 percent) of the variables were classified among the subcategories of the cognitive domain, 62 (68.2 percent) among those of the affective domain, and zero in the psychomotor domain.

The writers appear to have emphasized the need for principals to be committed to fulfilling their administrative responsibilities and to attempting to improve their capabilities in this area. A much smaller stress was placed on the principal's knowledge of the elements of this category or on the intellectual skills needed to perform the responsibilities inherent in this function.

Table 1 also reveals how the 29 variables assigned to the cognitive domain were distributed among the subcategories. It can be seen that 48.3 percent of the variables were assigned to level 1 (knowledge), 3.4 percent to level 2 (comprehension), 10.4 percent to level 3 (application), 3.4 percent to level 4 (analysis), 31.1 percent to level 5 (synthesis), and 3.4 percent to level 6 (evaluation).

Table 1. An Analysis of Journal Articles Denoting the Principal's Functions in Administrative Responsibility.

Level	Total No. Tallies	Percentage Total Tallies
Elementary School	7	7.7
Middle School	0	0.0
Junior High School	1	1.1
High School	31	34.1
Not Determined	52	57.1
Total	91	100.0
Cognitive Domain		
Level 1 (Knowledge)	14	48.3
Level 2 (Comprehension)	1	3.4
Level 3 (Application)	3	10.4
Level 4 (Analysis)	1	3.4
Level 5 (Synthesis)	9	31.1
Level 6 (Evaluation)	1	3.4
Total	29	100.0
Affective Domain		
Level 1 (Receiving)	8	12.9
Level 2 (Responding)	43	69.4
Level 3 (Valuing)	8	12.9
Level 4 (Organization)	2	3.2
Level 5 (Characterization)	1	1.6
Total	62	100.0
Psychomotor Domain		
Total	0	0.0

In the case of the 62 variables classified in the subcategories of the affective domain, 12.9 percent of them were assigned to level 1 (receiving, 69.4 percent to level 2 (responding), 12.9 percent to level 3 (valuing), 3.2 percent to level 4 (organization), 1.6 percent to level 5 (characterization).

An examination of Table 2 reveals that the variables were concentrated in the following categories: 4-1 (implementation of board policies); 4-3 (participation in system-wide policy making); 4-4 (relationship with the central staff) and 4-5 (maintenance of the school plant). As pointed out previously, no variables were coded for the middle school level and just one was coded for the junior high school level.

Table 2 shows that 18 variables were tallied for category 4-1 (implementation of board policies). Thirteen of these variables were tallied at the "not determined" level with the remainder having been tallied at the high school level.

Only one variable was tallied for category 4-3 (participation in system-wide policy making). Here again the emphasis was on the high school principal's function since five variables were assigned to that level; two were assigned to the elementary school level, one to the junior high school level and eight to the "not determined" level.

The principal's function in relationships with the central staff (category 4-4) received a great amount of attention from the authors. There were 19 variables tallied in all with the majority of them (12) having been assigned to the "not determined" level. This indicates that the writers may view the functions represented

Table 2. The Principal's Function Through Periodical Analysis in Administrative Responsibility Assigned by Subcategories to Levels of Schooling from 1970 through 1973.

	Subcategory	Level of Schooling				
		Elementary	Middle School	Junior High	High School	Not Determined
4-1	Implementation of board policies				5	13
4-2	Implementation of state school laws					1
4-3	Participation in system-wide policy making	2		1	5	8
4-4	Relationship with central staff	1			6	12
4-5	Maintenance of school plant	1			3	2
4-7	Appraisal of custodian's work	1				
4-10	School business management				1	
4-11	Purchasing of school supplies				1	
4-14	Budget preparation				1	3
4-15	Budget accounting					3
4-20	School plant planning				1	
4-21	Schedule making				1	
4-22	Work stoppage				1	2
4-24	Miscellaneous	2			6	8
	Total	7	0	1	31	52

in this category as being the common administrative responsibility of all principals. However, the high school principal's function was more emphasized than that of the elementary school principal because six variables were assigned to this level compared to the one assigned to the elementary school level.

The distribution of the variables of category 4-5 (maintenance of school plant) also reveals an emphasis on the high school principal's function. Three variables were assigned to this level compared to the one variable assigned to the elementary school level and the two variables assigned to the "not determined" level.

Just one variable was tallied for category 4-7 (appraisal of the custodian's work) and this was assigned to the elementary school level. Three variables were tallied for category 4-15 (budget accounting) and these were assigned to the "not determined" level. It is interesting to note that in the case of the rest of the categories which had tallies specifically assigned to a particular level of schooling, that in all cases there was one variable assigned to the high school level and none was assigned to any other level with the exception of the "not determined" level. These categories were as follows: category 4-10 (school business management); 4-11 (purchasing of school supplies); 4-14 (budget preparation); 4-20 (school plant planning); 4-21 (schedule making); 4-22 (work stoppage). While just one variable was tallied and assigned to the high school level for each of these categories, collectively, the fact that all were assigned to this level only, perhaps shows that the writers have emphasized the high school principal's function in this

administrative responsibility. Three variables were also tallied and assigned to the "not determined" level in the case of categories 4-14 and 4-22.

A total of 16 variables were tallied for category 4-24 (miscellaneous). The nature of these variables may be studied in Appendix G.

There were no variables tallied at any level of schooling for the principal's function in the inventory of school equipment (category 4-6), training of secretaries (cateogy 4-9), use of school supplies (category 4-13), school store (category 4-16), planning of school opening (category 4-17), opening day of school (category 4-18), and planning school closing (category 4-19).

Book Analysis

A study of Table 3 reveals that a total of 67 (43.3 percent) variables were coded for the book analysis of principal's function in administrative responsibility. Twenty-nine of these variables were coded for the elementary school level, 16 for the high school, (23.9 percent), zero for both the middle school and junior high school and 22 (32.8 percent) were coded for the "not determined" level.

The 67 variables assigned to the book analysis of the principal's function in administrative responsibility were also classified as denoting behavior in the cognitive or affective domains. No variables were classified as denoting psychomotor behavior. Each variable was assigned either to one of the six levels of the cognitive domain or to one of the five levels of the affective domain. Table 3 shows the manner in which the variables were thus distributed.

Table 3. An Analysis of Selected Books Denoting the Principal's Function in Administrative Responsibility.

Level	Total No. Tallies	Percentage Total Tallies
Elementary	29	43.3
Middle School	0	0.0
Junior High School	0	0.0
High School	16	23.9
Not Determined	22	32.8
Total	67	100.0
	Cognitive Domain	
Level 1 (Knowledge)	11	28.9
Level 2 (Comprehension)	3	7.9
Level 3 (Application)	1	2.6
Level 4 (Analysis)	2	5.3
Level 5 (Synthesis)	19	50.0
Level 6 (Evaluation)	2	5.3
Total	38	100.0
	Affective Domain	
Level 1 (Receiving)	1	3.4
Level 2 (Responding)	25	86.2
Level 3 (Valuing)	3	10.4
Level 4 (Organization)	0	0.0
Level 5 (Characterization)	0	0.0
Total	29	100.0
	Psychomotor Domain	
Total	0	0.0

Thirty-eight variables (56.7 percent of the total variables were assigned to the cognitive domain. They were distributed among the six levels of this domain as follows: 11 variables (28.9 percent) were classified in level 1 (knowledge); three (7.9 percent) in level 2 (comprehension); one (2.6 percent) in level 3 (application); two (5.3 percent) in level 4 (analysis); 19 (50.0 percent) in level 5 (synthesis); and two (5.3 percent) in level 6 (evaluation).

There were 29 variable (43.3 percent of the total variables) assigned to the five levels of the affective domain. One (3.4 percent) of them was classified in level 1 (receiving); 25 (86.2 percent) were classified in level 2 (responding); three (10.4 percent) in level 3 (valuing); and zero in levels 4 (organization) and 5 (characterization).

Table 4 shows how the 67 variables which were assigned to the principal's function in administrative responsibility were distributed among the levels of schooling. A brief examination of the table reveals that there was a concentration of the variables among the following categories: category 4-3 (participation in system-wide policy making); category 4-4 (relationship with central staff); category 4-5 (maintenance of school plant); category 4-6 (inventory of school equipment); category 4-10 (school business management); category 4-11 (purchasing of school supplies); category 4-12 (use of school supplies); category 4-13 (inventory of school supplies); category 4-14

Table 4. The Principal's Function in Administrative Responsibility Through Book Analysis Assigned by Subcategories to Levels of Schooling from 1970 through 1973.

	Subcategory	Level of Schooling				
		Elementary	Middle School	Junior High	High School	Not Determined
4-1	Implementation of board policies	1			1	
4-2	Implementation of state school laws	1				
4-3	Participation in systemwide policy making	2			1	1
4-4	Relationship with central staff	2			1	2
4-5	Maintenance of school plant	2				2
4-6	Inventory of School equipment	1			1	1
4-7	Appraisal of custodian's work	1				1
4-8	Training of secretaries	1				1
4-9	Evaluating secretaries work	1				1
4-10	School business management	1			1	1
4-11	Purchasing of school supplies	2			1	2

Table 4. (con't.)

		Level of Schooling				
		Elementary	Middle School	Junior High	High School	Not Determined
4-12	Use of school Supplies	1			1	1
4-13	Inventory of School Supplies	2			1	1
4-14	Budget preparation	3			1	1
4-15	Budget accounting	3				1
4-16	School store					1
4-17	Planning of School Opening	1			1	
4-18	Opening day of School					1
4-19	Planning school closing	1				1
4-20	School plant planning				1	1
4-21a	Schedule making-elementary school	2				
4-21d	Schedule making-high school				3	
4-23	Year-round school					1
4-24	Miscellaneous	1			2	1
	Total	29	0	0	16	22

(budget preparation); and category 4-15 (budget accounting).

Four variables were tallied for the principal's participation in system-wide policy making, two of which were assigned to the elementary school level and one each to the high school and "not determined" levels. Four variables were also tallied for the principal's function in the maintenance of the school plant, two of which were assigned to the elementary school level and two to the "not determined" level. Three variables were tallied for the principal's function in the inventory of school equipment. One variable in each case was assigned to the elementary school level, one to the high school level and one to the "not determined" level.

Three variables each were tallied for the principal's function in school business management and his use of school supplies. In both cases the variables were assigned to the same levels of schooling: one variable each was assigned in both cases to the elementary school, high school and "not determined" levels.

There were five variables each tallied for the principal's function in the purchasing of school supplies and in the preparation of the budget. In the first instance, two variables were assigned to the elementary school level, two to the "not determined" level, and one to the high school level. In the second instance, three variables were assigned to the elementary school level, and one each to the high school and "not determined" levels.

For the principal's function in the inventory of school supplies and in budget accounting, there were four variables tallied in each case. Two variables were assigned to the elementary school level and one each to the high school and "not determined" levels for the principal's function in the inventory of school supplies. For his function in budget accounting, there were three variables assigned to the elementary school level and one to the"not determined" level.

Two authors wrote about the principal's function in implementing board policies (category 4-1). One variable each was assigned to the elementary and high school levels. One author said that the elementary school principal must carefully implement board policies and make certain that the operational policies developed in his school are in keeping with those of the school system. However, the author who discussed the high school principal's function in implementing board policies stated that the principal should implement board policies in whatever manner he considers it to be in the best interests of the school and modify it, if he judges it desirable to do so.

Only one author considered the principal's function in implementing state school laws. This variable was assigned to the elementary school level. All that was said by the author was that the elementary school principal should produce a plan to communicate to his staff the most important state laws affecting the operation of the school.

Five variables were tallied for the principal's function in dealing with the central staff (category 4-4). Two of the variables were assigned to the elementary school level, two to the"not determined" level and one to the high school level.

There were two variables each tallied for the principal's function in the following: category 4-7 (appraisal of custodian's work); category 4-8 (training of secretaries); and category 4-9 (evaluating secretaries' work). In each case the variables were assigned to the elementary school and the "not determined" level.

Just one variable was tallied in each instance for the principal's function in the following: school story (category 4-16); opening day of school (category 4-18) and the year-round school (category 4-23).

In writing about the principal's function in running the school store, the author stated that the principal must never allow the store to be his hobby and that he must arrange for its operation in an efficient manner. The variable was assigned to the "not determined" level.

The variable tallied for the principal's function during the opening day of school was assigned to the "not determined" level, also. Here the author emphasized that the principal should prepare a list of where each one responsibility can be checked off as it is performed.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The principal should involve his staff in identifying potential barriers and problems when designing a plan to implement a year-round program was the gist of the author's advice regarding the principal's function in the year-round school. Here, too, the variable was assigned to the "not determined" level.

Two variables were tallied for the tallied for the elementary principal's function in schedule-making (category 4-21a) and were assigned to the elementary school level. There were three variables tallied for the high school principal's function in schedule-making (category 4-21d) and assigned to the high school level.

There were two variables each tallied for the principal's function in planning the opening (category 4-17) and closing (category 4-19) of school. In the case of the principal's function in planning the school opening, one variable was assigned to the elementary school level while the other variable was assigned to the high school level. For the principal's function in planning school closing, one variable was assigned to the elementary school level and the other to the "not determined" level.

Only two variables were tallied for the principal's function in school plant planning (category 4-20), and these variables were assigned to the high school and "not determined" levels. One author stated that the principal must know how to work with colleagues as well as with architectural, engineering, and construction specialists concerned with providing a functional facility

for learners. The second author said that the high school principal should prepare a "dummy" schedule for the classes proposed in the new building to determine the approximate room utilization and whether or not it is possible to offer the proposed program of studies. Four variables were tallied in the miscellaneous category (4-24).

None of the authors of the analyzed books wrote about the principal's function in schedule making at the middle school level (category 4-21b) and at the junior high school level (category 4-21c). Neither did any of these authors deal with the principal's function during a work stoppage (category 4-22).